

REMARKS

Claims 1 to 7, 11-14, 16-18, 25, 27, and 30 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 11, 12, 14, 18, 25 and 27-30 are amended herein.

The Objection to the Drawings

Replacement drawings are submitted herewith. It is respectfully submitted that the attached drawings correct the informalities noted in the Office Action.

The Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112

1. Claims 1-7, 11-14, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph for inconsistencies with the specification.

In particular the Office Action states that Applicant is using two names (i.e., “height sensor” and “height regulator valve” for the same valve. This is not the case. The height sensor is item 50 (see page 11, last paragraph). However, the hydraulic height regulator valve is item 210 (see Fig. 4 and specification page 14, lines 11-20.) The specification explains the advantage of using a height regulator valve 210 instead of the height sensor 50. Please note that the original specification erroneously identifies the height sensor as item 60. This is corrected by amendment herein. Accordingly, the height regulator valve 210 and the height sensor 50 are not two names for the same device.

The Office Action makes note of several instances where the claim language does not match the language in the specification. These are corrected either by amending the specification or the claims.

Regarding claim 1, “connected or connectable” is amended to read “connected.” “Can be” is changed in all occurrences to “is”.

In claim 2, “exclusively or also” is deleted.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the operation of the mechanical feedback loop 52, including reference to the conical area 34 and lug 32 are explained in the bottom paragraph at page 11 of the specification and shown in more clearly in the replacement drawings submitted herewith.

Claim 5 is amended to identify the cylinder as the strut cylinder.

Claim 12 is amended to correct the informalities noted in the Office Action.

Claimes 27, 28, 29 and 30 are amended as suggested in the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that the informalities noted in the Office Action have been corrected. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

#### The Rejection under Prior Art

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 12, 27 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,637,348 (“Teichmann et al.”)

Claims 12 and 27 are amended herein to additionally recite a horizontally movable displacement indicator. Support for this amendment can be found in the specification, for example, at page 11, lines 1-2, and in the drawings at Figs. 1 and 2. Teichmann, et al., neither discloses nor suggests the horizontally movable displacement indicator as claimed. Accordingly, claims 12 and 27, and all claims depending therefrom are submitted to be allowable over the cited prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

The Allowed Claims

Claims 4, 11, 14 and 29-30 are deemed to be allowable if rewritten to correct informalities and be placed in independent format. Claims 4, 11, 14 are placed into independent form by substantially incorporating the recitations of claims 27, (claim 14) and 1 (claims 4 and 11). It is respectfully submitted that these claims are now in condition for allowance.


Rejoinder of Claims

It is respectfully requested that withdrawn claims 16-18 and 25 be rejoined as they depend from claims which are submitted to be allowable.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above all of the pending claims are submitted to be in condition for allowance, the same being respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted



Adrian T. Calderone  
Reg. No. 31,746  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

DILWORTH & BARRESE, LLP  
333 Earle Ovington Blvd.  
Uniondale, NY 11553  
Tel: (516) 228-8484  
Fax: (516) 228-8516